

Remarks

Claims 1-22 are pending in the application.

Claims 12-22 are withdrawn from consideration.

Claims 1-11 are rejected.

Claim 1, 2, 6, 9 and 11 are amended herein.

Pursuant to the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment received herein, the Applicants have revised the response filed on January 22, 2008 to include the text of all withdrawn claims. Otherwise, the response herein is identical to that filed January 22, 2008.

I. 35 USC §112 Claim Rejections

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 USC §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Specifically, the claim was rejected on the basis that a method claim should contain more than one step. The Applicants have amended claim 1 to include two distinct steps of the claimed method. As so amended, the claim is believed to be responsive to, and to overcome the basis for this rejection. Withdrawal of the rejection is accordingly respectfully requested.

Claims 1-11 were rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Office Action points out that, although the preamble to claim 1 is addressed to a method of communication, the body of the claim is only addressed to transmission of data. The Action further notes that the Specification teaches that “communicating” corresponds with transmission and reception of data. The Applicants have amended the preamble to claim 1 in a manner that is believed to render the basis for this rejection moot. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Dependent claim 9 was also rejected under 35 USC §112 as being vague and indefinite, on the basis that the term “orthogonality rules” was unclear. The Applicants have replaced the objected-to term with “orthogonality”, which is believed to be well understood in the art.

II. Claim Objections

Claims 2-11 were objected to because of various identified informalities. The Applicants have amended the claims to address each of the identified informalities in the manner suggested by the Office Action.

III. Drawings


The informal drawings filed with the application were objected to on the basis of missing reference numbers. Replacement formal drawings, including the noted reference number corrections, are attached hereto. No new matter is added by these formal drawings.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, allowance of the amended claims and passage to issue of the subject application is respectfully requested. If the Examiner should feel that the application is not yet in a condition for allowance and that a telephone interview would be useful, he is invited to contact applicants' undersigned attorney at 973- 386-4237.

Respectfully submitted,

Raafat E Kamel et al.

By 
John Ligon
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No.: 35,938

Date: March 06, 2008

Docket Administrator (Room 2F-192)
Lucent Technologies Inc.
600-700 Mountain Avenue
Murray Hill, New Jersey 07974-0636

Serial No. 10/789086

ATTACHMENT

Formal Drawings